

DOCKET NO: 239266US3

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
RYOU KANNO, ET AL. : EXAMINER: HOFFMANN, JOHN M
SERIAL NO: 10/600,658 :
FILED: JUNE 23, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1731
FOR: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR :
POSITIONING A GLASS PLATE, AND
METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR BENDING
A GLASS PLATE

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated March 22, 2007, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse Invention I, Claims 1-6, 11-12, and 15-20, drawn to a method of conveying a glass sheet. Applicants make this election based on the understanding that Applicants are not prejudiced against filing one or more divisional applications that cover the non-elected claims.

In response to the Election of Species Requirement, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse Species A, drawn to Figure 6, and list Claims 1, 4-6, 11, and 12 as readable thereon.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Hoffmann to interview this case with Applicants' representatives on April 16, 2007, during which time the issues in the outstanding Restriction Requirement were discussed as substantially summarized hereinafter. Examiner Hoffmann indicated the Restriction Requirement dated

March 22, 2007 listed the claims incorrectly. Upon reviewing the claims, he indicated that Invention I should list Claims 1-6, 11-12, and 15-20, and Invention II should list Claims 7-10, 13-14, and 21-24. Examiner Hoffman also indicated that he agreed that Claims 1, 4-6, 11, and 12 read on Invention I, Species A.

Applicants traverse the outstanding requirements as the outstanding requirements have not established that a serious burden would be required if the requirements were not issued and if all the claims in the application were examined together. More particularly, MPEP §803 states:

If the search and examination of all the claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine them on the merits, even though they include claims to independent or distinct inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding Restriction and Election requirements on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement and the requirement to elect a single species be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1, 4-8, and 11-24 be conducted.

Should the Examiner deem that a personal or telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing this application toward allowance, he or she is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Edward W. Tracy, Jr.
Registration No. 47,998